



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Atexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/917,675	07/31/2001	Surendra Goel	06975-194001	06975-194001 1183	
26171	7590 09/24/2004	•	EXAMINER		
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W.			FLEURANTIN, JEAN B		
11TH FLOOF			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500			2172		

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/917,675	GOEL ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	2172				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		8-			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because. See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		•	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: NONE	•					
Claim(s) objected to: NONE.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-43</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument on page 11, that "Sullivan also does not describe searching indexes electronic content stored on a local device." It is submitted that Sullivan discloses a graphical user interface listing the downlooaded web pages and the aspects of the system applied to each of those web pages (see col. 17, lines 6-10). In response to applicant's argument on pages 11 and 12, that "there is no proper suggestion to combine Sullivan's teachings with Corey's system for searching", the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Sullivan discloses the client computer then sends a query request, to the remote network device, that includes the selected coordinates of the graphical image, in response to this query request, the remote network device uploads, to the client computer, the web page (i.e., a response) associated with the selected point (see Sullivan col. 9, line 65 to col. 10, line 12). Thus, the arguments are not persuasive.

MALA DIHAHS PRIMAKE YAMINER